

Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

**for State Grants under Title IX, Part C, Section 9302 of the Elementary and
Secondary Education Act (Public Law 107-110)**

DUE: JANUARY 31, 2003



**U. S. Department of Education
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education
Washington, D.C. 20202**

Instructions for Completing Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook

By January 31, 2003, States must complete and submit to the Department this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. We understand that some of the critical elements for the key principles may still be under consideration and may not yet be final State policy by the January 31 due date. States that do not have final approval for some of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31 should, when completing the Workbook, indicate the status of each element which is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

Transmittal Instructions

To expedite the receipt of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook, please send your submission via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Send electronic submissions to conapp@ed.gov.

A State that submits only a paper submission should mail the submission by express courier to:

Celia Sims
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Ave., SW
Room 3W300
Washington, D.C. 20202-6400
(202) 401-0113

PART I: Summary of Required Elements for State Accountability Systems

Instructions

The following chart is an overview of States' implementation of the critical elements required for approval of their State accountability systems. States must provide detailed implementation information for each of these elements in Part II of this Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

For each of the elements listed in the following chart, States should indicate the current implementation status in their State using the following legend:

- F:** State has a final policy, approved by all the required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature), for implementing this element in its accountability system.
- P:** State has a proposed policy for implementing this element in its accountability system, but must still receive approval by required entities in the State (e.g., State Board of Education, State Legislature).
- W:** State is still working on formulating a policy to implement this element in its accountability system.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

**Summary of Implementation Status for Required Elements of
State Accountability Systems**

Status	State Accountability System Element	
Principle 1: All Schools		
F	1.1	Accountability system includes <i>all schools and districts in the state</i> .
F	1.2	Accountability system holds <i>all schools to the same criteria</i> .
F	1.3	Accountability system incorporates the <i>academic achievement standards</i> .
F	1.4	Accountability system provides <i>information in a timely manner</i> .
F	1.5	Accountability system includes <i>report cards</i> .
F	1.6	Accountability system includes <i>rewards and sanctions</i> .
Principle 2: All Students		
F	2.1	The accountability system includes <i>all students</i>
F	2.2	The accountability system has a consistent definition of <i>full academic year</i> .
F	2.3	The accountability system properly includes <i>mobile students</i> .
Principle 3: Method of AYP Determinations		
F	3.1	Accountability system expects <i>all student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs to reach proficiency by 2013-14</i> .
F	3.2	Accountability system has a method for determining whether <i>student subgroups, public schools, and LEAs made adequate yearly progress</i> .
F	3.2a	Accountability system establishes a <i>starting point</i> .
F	3.2b	Accountability system establishes <i>statewide annual measurable objectives</i> .
F	3.2c	Accountability system establishes <i>intermediate goals</i> .
Principle 4: Annual Decisions		
F	4.1	The accountability system <i>determines annually the progress</i> of schools and districts.

STATUS Legend:

F – Final state policy

P – Proposed policy, awaiting State approval

W – Working to formulate policy

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

Principle 5: Subgroup Accountability

F	5.1	The accountability system <i>includes all the required student subgroups</i> .
F	5.2	The accountability system holds <i>schools and LEAs accountable for the progress of student subgroups</i> .
F	5.3	The accountability system includes <i>students with disabilities</i> .
F	5.4	The accountability system includes <i>limited English proficient students</i> .
F	5.5	The State has determined the minimum number of students sufficient to yield statistically reliable information for each purpose for which disaggregated data are used.
F	5.6	The State has strategies to protect the privacy of individual students in reporting achievement results and in determining whether schools and LEAs are making adequate yearly progress on the basis of disaggregated subgroups.

Principle 6: Based on Academic Assessments

F	6.1	Accountability system is based <i>primarily on academic assessments</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 7: Additional Indicators

F	7.1	Accountability system includes <i>graduation rate for high schools</i> .
F	7.2	Accountability system includes an <i>additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools</i> .
F	7.3	Additional indicators are valid and reliable.

Principle 8: Separate Decisions for Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics

F	8.1	Accountability system holds students, schools and districts separately accountable for <i>reading/language arts and mathematics</i> .
---	-----	---

Principle 9: System Validity and Reliability

F	9.1	Accountability system produces <i>reliable decisions</i> .
F	9.2	Accountability system produces <i>valid decisions</i> .
F	9.3	State has a plan for addressing <i>changes in assessment and student population</i> .

Principle 10: Participation Rate

F	10.1	Accountability system has a means for calculating the <i>rate of participation</i> in the statewide assessment.
F	10.2	Accountability system has a means for <i>applying the 95% assessment criteria to student subgroups and small schools</i> .

STATUS Legend:

F – Final policy

P – Proposed Policy, awaiting State approval

W– Working to formulate policy

PART II: State Response and Activities for Meeting State Accountability System Requirements

Instructions

In Part II of this Workbook, States are to provide detailed information for each of the critical elements required for State accountability systems. States should answer the questions asked about each of the critical elements in the State's accountability system. States that do not have final approval for any of these elements or that have not finalized a decision on these elements by January 31, 2003, should, when completing this section of the Workbook, indicate the status of each element that is not yet official State policy and provide the anticipated date by which the proposed policy will become effective. In each of these cases, States must include a timeline of steps to complete to ensure that such elements are in place by May 1, 2003, and implemented during the 2002-2003 school year. By no later than May 1, 2003, States must submit to the Department final information for all sections of the Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook.

PRINCIPLE 1. A single statewide Accountability System applied to all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.1 How does the State Accountability System include every public school and LEA in the State?</p>	<p>Every public school and LEA is required to make adequate yearly progress and is included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a definition of “public school” and “LEA” for AYP accountability purposes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The State Accountability System produces AYP decisions for all public schools, including public schools with variant grade configurations (e.g., K-12), public schools that serve special populations (e.g., alternative public schools, juvenile institutions, state public schools for the blind) and public charter schools. It also holds accountable public schools with no grades assessed (e.g., K-2). 	<p>A public school or LEA is not required to make adequate yearly progress and is not included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State policy systematically excludes certain public schools and/or LEAs.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>State law and regulations establish an accountability system that includes all public schools and districts in the state.</p> <p>Beginning in Cycle III (school years 2002/03 and 2003/04), K-2 schools with no MCAS results will be rated based on the grade 3 MCAS results of the schools their “graduates” attend. Any school with a sample size below the minimum required for ratings will be linked with and receive AYP determinations on the basis of test results of the schools their students attend in subsequent grades.</p> <p>Evidence: Statute and regulations; Cycle II State Summary Report; Cycle II notice to K-2 schools.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.2 How are all public schools and LEAs held to the same criteria when making an AYP determination?	<p>All public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of the same criteria when making an AYP determination.</p> <p>If applicable, the AYP definition is integrated into the State Accountability System.</p>	Some public schools and LEAs are systematically judged on the basis of alternate criteria when making an AYP determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>All schools are rated on performance and improvement using the same criteria, which are: ELA and mathematics proficiency indexes based on MCAS results, plus (beginning with Cycle III) attendance and graduation rate indicators. The definition and determination of AYP is integrated into our state accountability system.</p> <p>Evidence: Statute and regulations; Cycle II explanatory materials (transmittal folder / power-point slides)</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.3 Does the State have, at a minimum, a definition of <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> student achievement levels in reading/language arts and mathematics?</p>	<p>State has defined three levels of student achievement: <i>basic</i>, <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i>.¹</p> <p>Student achievement levels of <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> determine how well students are mastering the materials in the State's academic content standards; and the <i>basic</i> level of achievement provides complete information about the progress of lower-achieving students toward mastering the <i>proficient</i> and <i>advanced</i> levels.</p>	<p>Standards do not meet the legislated requirements.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Accountability system is based on MCAS results. MCAS is a custom designed assessment program based on MA student learning standards set out in State Curriculum Frameworks. MCAS assessments report student results in four performance categories: <i>Advanced</i>, <i>Proficient</i>, <i>Needs Improvement</i>, <i>Failing</i> (HS) / <i>Warning</i> (elementary and middle grades). Our performance levels are equivalent to those used in reporting NAEP results.</p> <p>Evidence: MCAS explanatory materials</p>		

¹ System of State achievement standards will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review. The Accountability Peer Review will determine that achievement levels are used in determining AYP.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.4 How does the State provide accountability and adequate yearly progress decisions and information in a timely manner?</p>	<p>State provides decisions about adequate yearly progress in time for LEAs to implement the required provisions before the beginning of the next academic year.</p> <p>State allows enough time to notify parents about public school choice or supplemental educational service options, time for parents to make an informed decision, and time to implement public school choice and supplemental educational services.</p>	<p>Timeline does not provide sufficient time for LEAs to fulfill their responsibilities before the beginning of the next academic year.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

MCAS tests are administered in the spring (April and May) to permit assessment of the full year of student attainment at the tested grade level. Tests include essay, open response and multiple choice items. Open response items are scored over the summer, with teachers participating in the scoring process. The timeline for reporting MCAS results to schools, parents and the public has been accelerated over past two years by more than 60 days, from late November to mid-September.

Beginning in 2003, the Massachusetts Department of Education will render preliminary AYP determinations and notify schools and districts of those determinations before the end of August of each year. We will require districts, upon receipt of this notice, to notify the parents of all students who are assigned to a school that has been preliminarily identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring of their school choice option. Parent notification will, under this plan, take place no later than the first week of each school year, in time for alternative school assignments to be arranged if requested.

Final school and district accountability reports and AYP determinations will be issued within 60 days after test results are returned. Once final accountability ratings and AYP determinations are issued we will revise the list of schools identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring to reflect any additions or deletions resulting from analysis of the final determinations. Districts, upon receipt of final accountability results, will notify parents of the final results and make mid-year choice available in any cases where the preliminary AYP finding did not identify a school that, based on final results, is identified for improvement, corrective action or restructuring. In cases where a school was preliminarily identified but does not appear on the final list of schools identified for improvement, the school and its district will be so informed and the school will be relieved of prospective requirements. Any school choice commitments (i.e., transportation costs) that were made based on the preliminary identification will be honored for the balance of the school year.

Evidence: MCAS release schedule 2002; SDAS Press release 2002 announcing accountability system results.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>1.5 Does the State Accountability System produce an annual State Report Card?</p>	<p>The State Report Card includes all the required data elements [see Appendix A for the list of required data elements].</p> <p>The State Report Card is available to the public at the beginning of the academic year.</p> <p>The State Report Card is accessible in languages of major populations in the State, to the extent possible.</p> <p>Assessment results and other academic indicators (including graduation rates) are reported by student subgroups</p>	<p>The State Report Card does not include all the required data elements.</p> <p>The State Report Card is not available to the public.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>School and district MCAS reports, as well as individual student reports are generated annually. Extensive information, including aggregate and disaggregated student assessment results and school and district performance ratings for every MA school and district is reported on DOE website. Downloadable, print-ready versions of LEA and school report cards are being developed. The target date for release for the first version of these NCLB compliant reports is March 15, 2003.</p> <p>Beginning in 2003, student subgroup information, as well as aggregate information, will be included in all report cards. Teacher data will be produced locally for inclusion in 2003 and 2004 district and school report cards, and submitted in the aggregate for inclusion in state report cards. MADOE is planning the development of a new teacher data warehouse. By 2005 we plan to have the data collection and storage systems in place to permit reliable State reporting of all teacher data we are required by federal law to include in annual state, district and school report cards.</p> <p>Evidence: Sample MCAS reports; Sample Web-version school and district profiles; mock-up of new report card format</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
1.6 How does the State Accountability System include rewards and sanctions for public schools and LEAs? ²	<p>State uses one or more types of rewards and sanctions, where the criteria are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set by the State; • Based on adequate yearly progress decisions; and, • Applied uniformly across public schools and LEAs. 	State does not implement rewards or sanctions for public schools and LEAs based on adequate yearly progress.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>State law provides for sanctions when school or districts are determined to be under-performing. Sanctions range from required improvement planning with State oversight, to removal of school principal and reassignment of staff for schools and district receivership when under-performance is chronic. Recognition and rewards are also part of the MA school and district accountability system. Schools with exemplary improvement may be named Compass Schools. Compass schools receive \$10,000 to assist with ongoing improvement initiatives and cover costs related to participation in effective practice dissemination activities. Privately funded cash awards are also given each year to principals of the most improved schools.</p> <p>Evidence: G.L. c. 69, sec. 1J an 1K; 603 CMR 2.00 Regulations on Underperforming Schools and Districts; 2002 Pathways To Improved Student Performance report (listing 2001 and 2002 Compass Schools)</p>		

² The state must provide rewards and sanctions for all public schools and LEAs for making adequate yearly progress, except that the State is not required to hold schools and LEAs not receiving Title I funds to the requirements of section 1116 of NCLB [§200.12(b)(40)].

PRINCIPLE 2. All students are included in the State Accountability System.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.1 How does the State Accountability System include all students in the State?	<p>All students in the State are included in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>The definitions of “public school” and “LEA” account for all students enrolled in the public school district, regardless of program or type of public school.</p>	Public school students exist in the State for whom the State Accountability System makes no provision.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>All students enrolled in public schools and those being educated in private schools at public expense are required to participate in the MCAS. Most students participate by taking the standard form of MCAS tests. A variety of accommodations are available to permit most students with disabilities to participate in the standard form of the test. Students with severe and complex disabilities for whom participation in the standard form of the MCAS tests is not feasible or educationally appropriate participate in the MCAS Alternate Assessment program.</p> <p>With the exception of students who are medically excused, beginning in 2003 all students enrolled at the time of testing will be expected to participate in MCAS assessments. Make up sessions are given for students absent from school on scheduled testing dates. Results for all students except those participating in Alternate Assessment will be included in determining a school, district or subgroup <i>proficiency index</i>. Beginning in Cycle III (2002 – 2004) we plan to include Alternate Assessment results in the school and district accountability system by use of an “Index of Alternate Assessment Attainment.”</p> <p>Beginning in the spring of 2004 an alternative form of the MCAS ELA test, based on the same high academic standards but specially designed to assess the level of skill and knowledge acquisition of students with limited English proficiency will be implemented. Baseline performance data for individual students using this new assessment will be collected in the fall of 2003.</p> <p>Evidence: MCAS and SDAS explanatory materials; Memo from Commissioner re: LEP testing and RFR for new ELP test design and administration</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
2.2 How does the State define “full academic year” for identifying students in AYP decisions?	<p>The State has a definition of “full academic year” for determining which students are to be included in decisions about AYP.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is consistent and applied statewide.</p>	<p>LEAs have varying definitions of “full academic year.”</p> <p>The State’s definition excludes students who must transfer from one district to another as they advance to the next grade.</p> <p>The definition of full academic year is not applied consistently.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Effective in 2001, the MADOE collects individual student data from local districts through our electronic Student Information Management System (“SIMS”). Districts are required to report student enrollment as of October 1 of each year. For purposes of the school and district accountability system, a student is considered to be enrolled in a school for a full year if he or she is enrolled as of October 1 of any school year and remains enrolled at that school up to and including the dates of MCAS test administration in the spring of that school year.</p> <p>Evidence: MCAS and SDAS explanatory materials</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>2.3 How does the State Accountability System determine which students have attended the same public school and/or LEA for a full academic year?</p>	<p>State holds public schools accountable for students who were enrolled at the same public school for a full academic year.</p> <p>State holds LEAs accountable for students who transfer during the full academic year from one public school within the district to another public school within the district.</p>	<p>State definition requires students to attend the same public school for more than a full academic year to be included in public school accountability.</p> <p>State definition requires students to attend school in the same district for more than a full academic year to be included in district accountability.</p> <p>State holds public schools accountable for students who have not attended the same public school for a full academic year.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>From 1998 – 2002, test results for all students who took the MCAS tests at a particular school were included in determining the accountability system ratings and AYP determinations for that school.</p> <p>Beginning in Cycle III, schools will only be accountable for the spring MCAS test results of students who, according to SIMS records, were enrolled in their school on October 1 of that school year. District accountability results will reflect performance of ALL students who took the MCAS tests while enrolled in the district's schools, regardless of enrollment date in the district.</p> <p>Evidence: Law and regulations; Memo from Director of Data Collection, Analysis and Reporting</p>		

PRINCIPLE 3. State definition of AYP is based on expectations for growth in student achievement that is continuous and substantial, such that all students are proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics no later than 2013-2014.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.1 How does the State's definition of adequate yearly progress require all students to be proficient in reading/language arts and mathematics by the 2013-2014 academic year?</p>	<p>The State has a timeline for ensuring that all students will meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement in reading/language arts³ and mathematics, not later than 2013-2014.</p>	<p>State definition does not require all students to achieve proficiency by 2013-2014.</p> <p>State extends the timeline past the 2013-2014 academic year.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>Effective for Cycle II (evaluating performance during the 2000/01 and 2001/02 school years) our target date for accomplishing the objective of all students becoming proficient and advanced was moved up to 2014. All schools are rated, and AYP determinations are made, based on an analysis of the performance and improvement schools and districts demonstrate toward achieving this goal. School and district performance is assessed using a proficiency index that measures the extent to which students have achieved or are progressing toward proficiency in ELA/reading and mathematics. Separate determinations are made for each subject. Improvement is rated by measuring change over time relative to accomplishment of the objective of getting all students proficient or advanced in ELA/reading and mathematics by 2014. Evidence: Cycle II explanatory materials.</p>		

³ If the state has separate assessments to cover its language arts standards (e.g., reading and writing), the State must create a method to include scores from all the relevant assessments.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2 How does the State Accountability System determine whether each student subgroup, public school and LEA makes AYP?</p>	<p>For a public school and LEA to make adequate yearly progress, each student subgroup must meet or exceed the State annual measurable objectives, each student subgroup must have at least a 95% participation rate in the statewide assessments, and the school must meet the State's requirement for other academic indicators.</p> <p>However, if in any particular year the student subgroup does not meet those annual measurable objectives, the public school or LEA may be considered to have made AYP, if the percentage of students in that group who did not meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State assessments for that year decreased by 10% of that percentage from the preceding public school year; that group made progress on one or more of the State's academic indicators; and that group had at least 95% participation rate on the statewide assessment.</p>	<p>State uses different method for calculating how public schools and LEAs make AYP.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Our AYP determination methodology was revised for Cycle II to incorporate the new NCLB target timeline. School and district AYP for the 2000/01 and 2001/02 school years was determined by comparing performance, for students in the aggregate, to State targets established by the NCLB formula, then comparing improvement to the rate of progress required to accomplish the goal of all students becoming proficient in ELA and mathematics by the year 2014. Beginning in Cycle III this methodology will also be used to determine AYP for subgroups.</p> <p>Evidence: Cycle II explanatory materials.</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>3.2a What is the State's starting point for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress?</p>	<p>Using data from the 2001-2002 school year, the State established separate starting points in reading/language arts and mathematics for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the State's proficient level of academic achievement.</p> <p>Each starting point is based, at a minimum, on the higher of the following percentages of students at the proficient level: (1) the percentage in the State of proficient students in the lowest-achieving student subgroup; or, (2) the percentage of proficient students in a public school at the 20th percentile of the State's total enrollment among all schools ranked by the percentage of students at the proficient level.</p> <p>A State may use these procedures to establish separate starting points by grade span; however, the starting point must be the same for all like schools (e.g., one same starting point for all elementary schools, one same starting point for all middle schools...).</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses a different method for calculating the starting point (or baseline data).</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>We have calculated our starting points for ELA and math using NCLB prescribed methodology (rank ordered lists for ELA and mathematics with determination of performance level of school representing 20th percentile of state enrollment. 20th percentile schools were higher performing in both ELA and mathematics than our lowest performing subgroup).</p> <p>Our State starting point for ELA is 39.7% proficient and advanced, which equates to a proficiency index of 70.7. For mathematics our starting point is 19.5% proficient and advanced, which equates to a proficiency index of 53. We used our State's NCLB "starting points" as our Cycle II targets for determining AYP for the years 2001 and 2002.</p> <p>Evidence: State Starting Point Determination slides; Cycle II explanatory materials.</p>	

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2b What are the State's annual measurable objectives for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has annual measurable objectives that are consistent with a state's intermediate goals and that identify for each year a minimum percentage of students who must meet or exceed the proficient level of academic achievement on the State's academic assessments.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives ensure that all students meet or exceed the State's proficient level of academic achievement within the timeline.</p> <p>The State's annual measurable objectives are the same throughout the State for each public school, each LEA, and each subgroup of students.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System uses another method for calculating annual measurable objectives.</p> <p>The State Accountability System does not include annual measurable objectives.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>We have established State targets for ELA and math performance, progressing in equal increments from for each two-year period from 2002 – 2014 from our state starting points for ELA and Mathematics to our goals, by 2014, of having all students performing at proficient and advanced levels in these subjects. To make AYP districts, schools and subgroups must demonstrate student performance above the State target for that time period or show improvement at a rate that, projected forward, puts the school “on target” for getting all student to proficiency or above by 2014. . At mid-cycle the improvement goal for determining AYP will be 2/3 of improvement target for that two-year cycle.</p> <p>Specific performance targets for attendance and graduation rate for each rating cycle between 2002 and 2014 will be set by the MA Board of Education in the spring of 2002 after consultation and review by practitioners and the public. We plan to propose chronic absence by individual students as the measure for which attendance targets will be set. On an interim basis, until we have the data required to calculate a four-year graduation rate, we plan to propose goals related to annual graduation rate (which, effective with the class of 2003, requires passing rate on MCAS tests) and dropout rates.</p> <p>Evidence: State Starting Point Determination slides; Commissioner's memo to Board of Ed 12/10/02</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
3.2c What are the State's intermediate goals for determining adequate yearly progress?	<p>State has established intermediate goals that increase in equal increments over the period covered by the State timeline.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first incremental increase takes effect not later than the 2004-2005 academic year. • Each following incremental increase occurs within three years. 	<p>The State uses another method for calculating intermediate goals.</p> <p>The State does not include intermediate goals in its definition of adequate yearly progress.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS					EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
We have established State targets for ELA and math performance, expressed as a school, district, or subgroup proficiency index target, for each two-year cycle from 2002 – 2014. A proficiency index of 100 indicates that 100% of students are performing at proficient or advanced levels. The MA performance targets for 2004 - 2014 are:						
Year	<u>2004</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2008</u>	<u>2010</u>	<u>2012</u>	<u>2014</u>
ELA	75.6	80.5	85.4	90.2	95.1	100
Mathematics	60.8	68.7	76.5	84.3	92.2	100
Performance targets for attendance and graduation rates will be set by Board during 2002.						
Evidence: State Starting Point Determination slides; Commissioner’s memo to Board of Ed 12/10/02						

PRINCIPLE 4. State makes annual decisions about the achievement of all public schools and LEAs.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
4.1 How does the State Accountability System make an annual determination of whether each public school and LEA in the State made AYP?	AYP decisions for each public school and LEA are made annually. ⁴	AYP decisions for public schools and LEAs are not made annually.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

⁴ Decisions may be based upon several years of data and data may be averaged across grades within a public school [§1111(b)(2)(J)].

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>We issue school performance ratings every other year, in even numbered years. Beginning in the fall of 2003 we will make mid-cycle AYP determinations for schools identified for improvement at the end of the last rating cycle (Cycle II). Those results will be included in the 2003-2004 school year state, district and school report cards. Schools that did not make AYP in 2003 will be so notified and informed of the consequences of that determination.</p> <p>In 2004, we plan to issue end of cycle ratings and AYP determinations for 2003 and 2004 for all schools, districts and subgroups. Beginning in 2005 and continuing in odd numbered years thereafter we plan to issue mid-cycle AYP determinations for all schools, districts and subgroups. For mid-cycle determinations we plan to review progress in the first year of the rating period toward achievement of the targets for that cycle. AYP determinations will be made by comparing mid-cycle performance to the State target for each indicator. For schools below the target we will determine the adequacy of the rate of improvement demonstrated relative to meeting the goal of all students becoming proficient or advanced by 2014 and determine whether the NCLB safe-harbor criteria are met. On MCAS indicators, to make AYP at mid-cycle schools will be expected to show improvement equal to or greater than 2/3 of their target for the cycle.</p> <p>Evidence: Planned SDAS Changes for Cycle III, Associate Commissioner Dow</p>	

PRINCIPLE 5. All public schools and LEAs are held accountable for the achievement of individual subgroups.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.1 How does the definition of adequate yearly progress include all the required student subgroups?	<p>Identifies subgroups for defining adequate yearly progress: economically disadvantaged, major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and students with limited English proficiency.</p> <p>Provides definition and data source of subgroups for adequate yearly progress.</p>	State does not disaggregate data by each required student subgroup.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Since 2001 we have reported subgroup results on MCAS tests. Using our new Student Information Management System, we are able to match student data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups. Subgroup ratings and AYP determinations for special education students, limited English proficient students, economically disadvantaged students, and students in racial and ethnic minority groups will be included in school and district accountability system reports beginning in 2003.</p> <p>Evidence: Sample MCAS reports; Memo from General Counsel confirming Board vote 12/18/02</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.2 How are public schools and LEAs held accountable for the progress of student subgroups in the determination of adequate yearly progress?	Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for student subgroup achievement: economically disadvantaged, major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and limited English proficient students.	State does not include student subgroups in its State Accountability System.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Using our new Student Information Management System, we are able to match student data with test results and tabulate results for all required subgroups. For each school and district, subgroup ratings and AYP determinations will be issued using the same reporting rules used to determine ratings and AYP determinations for students in the aggregate.</p> <p>Evidence: Sample MCAS reports; Memo from General Counsel confirming Board vote 12/18/02</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.3 How are students with disabilities included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All students with disabilities participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or an alternate assessment based on grade level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p> <p>State demonstrates that students with disabilities are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	<p>The State Accountability System or State policy excludes students with disabilities from participating in the statewide assessments.</p> <p>State cannot demonstrate that alternate assessments measure grade-level standards for the grade in which students are enrolled.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Most students with disabilities participate in MCAS testing, with accommodations if required. MCAS results for all disabled students who take standard MCAS tests are included in determination of a school, district or subgroup's proficiency index. Severely intellectually/cognitively impaired students for whom the standard MCAS test is not appropriate participate in the MCAS Alternate Assessment program. We plan to include the results of Alternate Assessments in the accountability system beginning in 2003 through introduction of an "index of alternative assessment attainment."</p> <p>Evidence: Memo from Associate Commissioner Dow re: Planned SDAS Changes for Cycle III</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.4 How are students with limited English proficiency included in the State's definition of adequate yearly progress?	<p>All LEP student participate in statewide assessments: general assessments with or without accommodations or a native language version of the general assessment based on grade level standards.</p> <p>State demonstrates that LEP students are fully included in the State Accountability System.</p>	LEP students are not fully included in the State Accountability System.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Beginning in 2003 all LEP students will participate in the MCAS assessment program, either by taking the standard form of the test with accommodations as appropriate or by taking an alternative assessment that is aligned with state learning standards. Test results for those taking the standard MCAS test with or without accommodations will be included in determining a school, district, or subgroup proficiency index. LEP students that participate, beginning in 2004, in the MCAS program by taking an alternative version of the ELA test specifically designed to measure language and content acquisition by students with limited English proficiency will have their results included in school and district accountability determinations beginning in 2005 using by introduction of an index designed specifically to measure attainment using that assessment tool.</p> <p>Evidence: MCAS explanatory materials; 11/19/02 Memo from Commissioner Driscoll to Board of Education re: plans for testing LEP students</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.5 What is the State's definition of the minimum number of students in a subgroup required for reporting purposes? For accountability purposes?	<p>State defines the number of students required in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes, and applies this definition consistently across the State.⁵</p> <p>Definition of subgroup will result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>	<p>State does not define the required number of students in a subgroup for reporting and accountability purposes.</p> <p>Definition is not applied consistently across the State.</p> <p>Definition does not result in data that are statistically reliable.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>To achieve reliability and validity of accountability decisions, our minimum sample size for reporting performance is an average of 20 students/year for each 2 year rating period, and no fewer than 15 students in any one year. We issue improvement ratings, using a standard error band of 2.5 points, for all schools and districts that have an average of 50 students/year and no fewer than 40 students in any one year. For schools with an average of 20 or more but fewer than 50 students/year, we use a custom determined error-band of up to 4.5 points to determine improvement ratings and only issue ratings when a 95% confidence level can be achieved. The minimum sample size rules apply to each year for which data is included and will apply, beginning in Cycle III, to our calculation of sub-group ratings and AYP determinations.</p> <p>Evidence: Cycle II explanatory materials.</p>		

⁵ The minimum number is not required to be the same for reporting and accountability.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
5.6 How does the State Accountability System protect the privacy of students when reporting results and when determining AYP?	Definition does not reveal personally identifiable information. ⁶	Definition reveals personally identifiable information.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>To ensure confidentiality of individual student information we do not report results for groups less than 10.</p> <p>Evidence: MCAS explanatory materials.</p>		

⁶ The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) prohibits an LEA that receives Federal funds from releasing, without the prior written consent of a student's parents, any personally identifiable information contained in a student's education record.

PRINCIPLE 6. State definition of AYP is based primarily on the State's academic assessments.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
6.1 How is the State's definition of adequate yearly progress based primarily on academic assessments?	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on assessments.⁷</p> <p>Plan clearly identifies which assessments are included in accountability.</p>	<p>Formula for AYP shows that decisions are based primarily on non-academic indicators or indicators other than the State assessments.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>For Cycles I and II, the MA school and district accountability system had student performance results on state MCAS tests as its only indicators. In conformance with NCLB, an additional indicator is being added [graduation rate for High Schools and attendance at elementary and middle school levels] for Cycle III.</p> <p>Evidence: SDAS Framework and Cycle II explanatory materials</p>		

⁷ State Assessment System will be reviewed by the Standards and Assessments Peer Review Team.

PRINCIPLE 7. State definition of AYP includes graduation rates for public High schools and an additional indicator selected by the State for public Middle and public Elementary schools (such as attendance rates).

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.1 What is the State definition for the public high school graduation rate?</p>	<p>State definition of graduation rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculates the percentage of students, measured from the beginning of the school year, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the state's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or, • Uses another more accurate definition that has been approved by the Secretary; and • Must avoid counting a dropout as a transfer. <p>Graduation rate is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause⁸ to make AYP.</p>	<p>State definition of public high school graduation rate does not meet these criteria.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		

⁸ See USC 6311(b)(2)(I)(i), and 34 C.F.R. 200.20(b)

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
	<p>At its December 2002 meeting the MA Board of Education approved modification of the MA SDAS to include graduation rates as an additional indicator for high schools. We will begin reporting graduation rates using the NCLB definition in 2005, using SIMS data from 2001 – 2005. The rate will be calculated as follows:</p> <p><u># Graduates (with regular diploma) who completed high school in four years</u> <u>Divided by</u> [# Graduates (same as above) + # of 9th grade dropouts/retentions + # 10th grade dropouts/retentions + # 11th grade dropouts/retentions + # 12th grade dropouts/retentions + # students who complete 12th grade without a regular diploma]</p> <p>The data for each class will be tracked going forward from 9th grade. Dropouts are defined as students who leave school prior to graduation for reasons other than transfer to another school. Students who are retained in grade, and thus leave their original class, will not count toward the number of graduates, but will be included in the denominator as members of the original class. In the interim, until SIMS data to perform the calculation set out above becomes available, we plan to define and use an alternative measure, based on schools' reported aggregate dropout and graduation data. The interim measure, for the class of 2003 and 2004, will be the percentage of students who took the 10th grade MCAS, who graduated with a competency determination (MCAS graduation standard) two years later. Students that transfer in or out of the school after the 10th grade test administration will not be included in the denominator or numerator.</p> <p><u># Graduates (with regular diploma) who took the 10th grade MCAS two years prior</u> (# of students enrolled at the time of the 10th grade test two years prior) - (# students who transferred in or out of the class since the 10th grade test)</p> <p>Evidence: Memo from General Counsel confirming Board vote; Memo from Director of Data Collection, Analysis and Reporting explaining graduation rate calculation method.</p>	

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>7.2 What is the State's additional academic indicator for public elementary schools for the definition of AYP? For public middle schools for the definition of AYP?</p>	<p>State defines the additional academic indicators, e.g., additional State or locally administered assessments not included in the State assessment system, grade-to-grade retention rates or attendance rates.⁹</p> <p>An additional academic indicator is included (in the aggregate) for AYP, and disaggregated (as necessary) for use when applying the exception clause to make AYP.</p>	<p>State has not defined an additional academic indicator for elementary and middle schools.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>At its December 2002 meeting the MA Board of Education approved modification of the MA SDAS to include attendance as an additional indicator for elementary and middle schools. State goals and school and district performance and improvement standards for this indicator will be decided in 2003. We plan to propose a standard and interim goals and annual improvement objectives related to reduction in the instance of chronic student absence rather than average attendance.</p> <p>Evidence: Memo from General Counsel confirming Board vote.</p>		

⁹ NCLB only lists these indicators as examples.

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
7.3 Are the State's academic indicators valid and reliable?	<p>State has defined academic indicators that are valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has defined academic indicators that are consistent with nationally recognized standards, if any.</p>	<p>State has an academic indicator that is not valid and reliable.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent with nationally recognized standards.</p> <p>State has an academic indicator that is not consistent within grade levels.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Beginning in 2001, we now collect student data on an individual basis through the MA Student Information Management System (SIMS). The reliability of data reporting has been greatly enhanced through implementation of this system.</p> <p>Evidence: SIMS Data Standards Handbook (excerpt)</p>		

PRINCIPLE 8. AYP is based on reading/language arts and mathematics achievement objectives.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
8.1 Does the state measure achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics separately for determining AYP?	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs separately measures reading/language arts and mathematics.¹⁰</p> <p>AYP is a separate calculation for reading/language arts and mathematics for each group, public school, and LEA.</p>	<p>State AYP determination for student subgroups, public schools and LEAs averages or combines achievement across reading/language arts and mathematics.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Yes. During Cycle I we reported results separately for ELA, math, and science, then combined data to create an “Overall” rating. For Cycle II, we dropped the overall ratings and only reported subject specific ratings and AYP determinations. Going forward, we will issue separate ratings and AYP determinations for ELA and mathematics.</p> <p>Evidence: Cycle II explanatory material</p>		

¹⁰ If the state has more than one assessment to cover its language arts standards, the State must create a method for including scores from all the relevant assessments.

PRINCIPLE 9. State Accountability System is statistically valid and reliable.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.1 How do AYP determinations meet the State's standard for acceptable reliability?</p>	<p>State has defined a method for determining an acceptable level of reliability (decision consistency) for AYP decisions.</p> <p>State provides evidence that decision consistency is (1) within the range deemed acceptable to the State, and (2) meets professional standards and practice.</p> <p>State publicly reports the estimate of decision consistency, and incorporates it appropriately into accountability decisions.</p> <p>State updates analysis and reporting of decision consistency at appropriate intervals.</p>	<p>State does not have an acceptable method for determining reliability (decision consistency) of accountability decisions, e.g., it reports only reliability coefficients for its assessments.</p> <p>State has parameters for acceptable reliability; however, the actual reliability (decision consistency) falls outside those parameters.</p> <p>State's evidence regarding accountability reliability (decision consistency) is not updated.</p>
<p>STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS</p>		
<p>We use two years of data combined to increase reliability. Use of proficiency index in Cycle II increased reliability of decisions compared to criteria for Cycle I performance ratings. Proficiency index determinations are more stable than findings based simply on percent proficient and advanced.</p> <p>Evidence: Cycle II explanatory materials</p>		

CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION ACCOUNTABILITY WORKBOOK

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
9.2 What is the State's process for making valid AYP determinations?	State has established a process for public schools and LEAs to appeal an accountability decision.	State does not have a system for handling appeals of accountability decisions.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>Our assessment system results have been validated using comparisons with other standardized tests and review of alignment with State standards. These results are the primary indicators on which AYP determinations are made. We use minimum sample size rules to ensure the reliability of AYP findings. We look at both absolute performance and improvement to ensure that valid judgement are being rendered with respect to the adequacy of progress by a school toward achieving state and federal student performance goals.</p> <p>Evidence: MCAS technical documents and Achieve report published on DOE MCAS website</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>9.3 How has the State planned for incorporating into its definition of AYP anticipated changes in assessments?</p>	<p>State has a plan to maintain continuity in AYP decisions necessary for validity through planned assessment changes, and other changes necessary to comply fully with NCLB.¹¹</p> <p>State has a plan for including new public schools in the State Accountability System.</p> <p>State has a plan for periodically reviewing its State Accountability System, so that unforeseen changes can be quickly addressed.</p>	<p>State's transition plan interrupts annual determination of AYP.</p> <p>State does not have a plan for handling changes: e.g., to its assessment system, or the addition of new public schools.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>The proficiency index system allows us to incorporate results from new test administrations without disruption of accountability decisions. We require two years of baseline data, and two years in the rating period for determination of improvement. Evidence: Cycle II explanatory materials.</p>		

¹¹ Several events may occur which necessitate such a plan. For example, (1) the State may need to include additional assessments in grades 3-8 by 2005-2006; (2) the State may revise content and/or academic achievement standards; (3) the State may need to recalculate the starting point with the addition of new assessments; or (4) the State may need to incorporate the graduation rate or other indicators into its State Accountability System. These events may require new calculations of validity and reliability.

PRINCIPLE 10. In order for a public school or LEA to make AYP, the State ensures that it assessed at least 95% of the students enrolled in each subgroup.

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF NOT MEETING REQUIREMENTS
<p>10.1 What is the State's method for calculating participation rates in the State assessments for use in AYP determinations?</p>	<p>State has a procedure to determine the number of absent or untested students (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>State has a procedure to determine the denominator (total enrollment) for the 95% calculation (by subgroup and aggregate).</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are held accountable for reaching the 95% assessed goal.</p>	<p>The state does not have a procedure for determining the rate of students participating in statewide assessments.</p> <p>Public schools and LEAs are not held accountable for testing at least 95% of their students.</p>
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>We have reliable enrollment data from the MCAS testing program and from our new SIMS system. We routinely calculate and report participation rates in MCAS testing program. We began reporting participation rates on Cycle II accountability system reports.</p> <p>Participation rates on the MCAS are calculated as follows:</p> <p># of students with test results <u>(includes those students absent without a medically documented excuse, given a minimum score)</u> # of students enrolled at the time of test administration Students participating in the alternate assessment are included in the numerator and denominator.</p> <p>Evidence: MCAS reports;</p>		

CRITICAL ELEMENT	EXAMPLES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS	EXAMPLES OF <i>NOT</i> MEETING REQUIREMENTS
10.2 What is the State's policy for determining when the 95% assessed requirement should be applied?	State has a policy that implements the regulation regarding the use of 95% allowance when the group is statistically significant according to State rules.	State does not have a procedure for making this determination.
STATE RESPONSE AND STATE ACTIVITIES FOR MEETING REQUIREMENTS		
<p>In Cycle II we began reporting participation rates on school rating reports. For Cycle III the 95% participation rate rule will be applied to making AYP decisions.</p> <p>Evidence: Sample Cycle II school rating report</p>		

Appendix A

Required Data Elements for State Report Card

1111(h)(1)(C)

1. Information, in the aggregate, on student achievement at each proficiency level on the State academic assessments (disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
2. Information that provides a comparison between the actual achievement levels of each student subgroup and the State's annual measurable objectives for each such group of students on each of the academic assessments.
3. The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the student subgroups), except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student.
4. The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area, and for each grade level, for the required assessments.
5. Aggregate information on any other indicators used by the State to determine the adequate yearly progress of students in achieving State academic achievement standards disaggregated by student subgroups.
6. Graduation rates for secondary school students disaggregated by student subgroups.
7. Information on the performance of local educational agencies in the State regarding making adequate yearly progress, including the number and names of each school identified for school improvement under section 1116.
8. The professional qualifications of teachers in the State, the percentage of such teachers teaching with emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes in the State not taught by highly qualified teachers, in the aggregate and disaggregated by high-poverty compared to low-poverty schools which (for this purpose) means schools in the top quartile of poverty and the bottom quartile of poverty in the State.